

Locking classical correlation in quantum states

David P. DiVincenzo^{1,2}, Michał Horodecki³, Debbie W. Leung^{1,2,4}, John A. Smolin¹, and Barbara M. Terhal^{1,2}

¹IBM Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, USA

²Institute for Quantum Information, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125-8100, USA

³Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Univ. of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland and

⁴Mathematical Science Research Institute, 1000 Centennial Drive, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We show that there exist bipartite quantum states which contain large hidden classical correlation that can be unlocked by a disproportionately small amount of classical communication. In particular, there are $(2n + 1)$ -qubit states for which a one bit message doubles the optimal classical mutual information between measurement results on the subsystems, from $n/2$ bits to n bits. States exhibiting this behavior need not be entangled. We study the range of states exhibiting this phenomenon and bound its magnitude.

The study of possible correlations between quantum systems was initiated by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1] and Schrödinger [2]. These pioneers were concerned with entanglement — quantum correlation that are non-existent in classical physics. Recent development in quantum information theory has motivated extensive study of entanglement (see [3] for a review). Furthermore, an exciting subject of characterizing other interesting types of correlations has emerged. For example, quantum correlation, classical one, or quantum *and* classical correlation have been studied [4, 5, 6, 7, 8].

The classical mutual information of a quantum state ρ_{AB} can be defined naturally [8] as the maximum classical mutual information that can be obtained by local measurements $M_A \otimes M_B$ on the state ρ_{AB} :

$$I_c(\rho) \equiv \max_{M_A \otimes M_B} I(A:B). \quad (1)$$

Here $I(A:B)$ is the classical mutual information defined as $I(A:B) \equiv H(p_A) + H(p_B) - H(p_{AB})$, H is the entropy function [9], and p_{AB}, p_A, p_B are the probability distributions of the joint and individual outcomes of performing the local measurement $M_A \otimes M_B$ on ρ . The physical relevance of I_c is many-fold. First, $I_c(\rho)$ is the maximum classical correlation obtainable from ρ by purely local processing. Second, $I_c(\rho)$ corresponds to the classical definition when ρ is “classical,” i.e., diagonal in some local product basis and corresponds to a classical distribution. Third, when ρ is pure, $I_c(\rho)$ is the correlation defined by the Schmidt basis and thus equal to the entanglement of the pure state [10, 11]. Finally $I_c(\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ [12].

Any good correlation measure should satisfy certain axiomatic properties. First, correlation is a nonlocal property and should not increase under local processing (*monotonicity*) (I). Second, a protocol starting from an uncorrelated initial state and using l qubits or $2l$ classical bits of communication (one-way or two-way) and local operations should not create more than $2l$ bits of correlation. We call this property *total proportionality* (II). The intuition is that if $2l$ bits of correlation can be es-

tablished with fewer than $2l$ bits of communication, then it may be possible to establish nonzero correlation with no communication if the receiver guesses the message.

We may expect other properties for any correlation measure. If a protocol has several rounds of communication, one may consider the increase of correlation due to each round of communication. Intuitively, a small amount of communication should not increase correlation abruptly. In particular, one may expect that the transmission of l qubits or $2l$ bits should not increase the correlation of *any initial state* by more than $2l$ bits. We call this property *incremental proportionality* (III). This strengthens total proportionality by allowing all possible initial states, or equivalently by considering the increase in correlation step-wise. Other properties such as continuity in ρ are also expected (IV).

All of these properties (I-IV) hold for some well known correlation measures. They hold for the classical mutual information $I(A:B)$ when communication is classical [13] as one may expect. They also hold for the quantum mutual information $I_q(\rho)$ [8] (for any communication). Here $I_q(\rho) \equiv S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho)$ with $S(\rho) \equiv -\text{Tr} \rho \log \rho$ being the von Neumann entropy and $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B \rho$, $\rho_B = \text{Tr}_A \rho$. In Ref. [8] monotonicity, total proportionality, and continuity have been proved for I_c , while incremental proportionality was only proved for pure initial state ρ (for any communication) and for the classical restriction.

In this paper, we report the surprising fact that *incremental proportionality* for I_c can be violated in some extreme manner for a mixed initial state ρ . We will see that a single classical bit, sent from Alice to Bob, can result in an *arbitrarily large* increase in I_c . This phenomenon can be viewed as a way of locking classical correlation in the quantum state ρ . If one-bit of communication increases I_c by a large amount, the correlation must be “present” initially, though hidden or locked as indicated by a small initial value of I_c . Only after the one-bit transmission can the large amount of correlation become accessible or unlocked. Since incremental proportionality of I_c holds classically, the phenomenon of locked correlation is a purely

quantum effect. It is a direct consequence of the indistinguishability of non-orthogonal quantum states. Applications of such indistinguishability are well known, most notably in quantum key distribution [14] and the various partial quantum bit commitment and coin tossing protocols (see [15, 16] and references therein). Curiously, the simple effect that we observe and bound in this paper had not been noted before.

For a given initial state ρ and the amount and type of communication, we can capture the increase in correlation by defining the following functions:

$$I_c^{(l)}(\rho) = \max_{\Lambda^{(l)}} I_c(\Lambda^{(l)}(\rho)), \quad I_c^{[l]}(\rho) = \max_{\Lambda^{[l]}} I_c(\Lambda^{[l]}(\rho)). \quad (2)$$

The operator Λ denotes a bipartite quantum operation consists of local operations and no more than l bits or qubits of communication, a constraint denoted by the superscript (l) or $[l]$. Note that $I_c(\rho) = I_c^{(0)}(\rho) = I_c^{[0]}(\rho)$. Throughout the paper, we use ρ and ρ' to denote the states before and after the quantum operation with communication, $\rho' = \Lambda(\rho)$.

With this notation, we summarize our main results:

- We present an example in which 1 bit of classical communication increases I_c by $\frac{1}{2} \log d$ bits, where ρ consists of $1 + \log d$ and $\log d$ qubits in Alice and Bob's systems respectively. Since I_c satisfies total proportionality, the classical correlation can be viewed as being locked in the state ρ and then unlocked in ρ' by the 1-bit message.
- We bound the extent of incremental proportionality violation in terms of the amount of initial correlation and the amount of communication. The amount of correlation unlocked by l bits of 1-way classical communication can be bounded as (Theorem 1)

$$I_c^{(l)}(\rho) - I_c(\rho) \leq l + (2^l - 1) I_c(\rho). \quad (3)$$

For small $I_c(\rho)$, the amount unlocked by l qubits (two-way) can be bounded as (Theorem 2)

$$I_c^{[l]}(\rho) - I_c(\rho) \leq 2l + O(d^2 \sqrt{I_c(\rho)} \log I_c(\rho)). \quad (4)$$

We now describe the example in which an arbitrary amount of correlation is unlocked with a one-bit message. The initial state ρ is shared between subsystems held by Alice and Bob, with respective dimensions $2d$ and d ,

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{t=0}^1 (|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|)_A \otimes (U_t|k\rangle\langle k|U_t^\dagger)_B. \quad (5)$$

Here $U_0 = I$ and U_1 changes the computational basis to a conjugate basis ($\forall_{i,k} |\langle i|U_1|k\rangle| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$). In this example, Bob is given a random draw $|k\rangle$ from d states in two possible random bases (depending on $t = 0$ or 1), while Alice has complete knowledge of his state. To achieve $I_c^{(1)}(\rho) = \log d + 1$, Alice sends t to Bob, who then undoes U_t on his state and measures k in the computational basis. Alice and Bob now share both k and t , with $\log d + 1$ bits of correlation.

For example, the state ρ can arise from the following scenario. Let $d = 2^n$. Alice picks a random n -bit string k and sends Bob $|k\rangle$ or $H^{\otimes n}|k\rangle$ depending on whether the random bit $t = 0$ or 1 . Here H is the Hadamard transform. Alice can send t to Bob to unlock the correlation later. Experimentally, Hadamard transform and measurement on single qubits are sufficient to prepare the state ρ and later extract the unlocked correlation in ρ' – they can be realized using photons and linear optical elements like quarter-wave plates and calcite crystals.

Now we prove that $I_c(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \log d$. First, the complete measurement M_A along $\{|k\rangle \otimes |t\rangle\}$ is provably optimal for Alice: Since the outcome tells her precisely which pure state from the ensemble she has, she can apply *classical, local* post-processing to obtain the output distribution for any other measurement she could have performed. For Alice's choice of optimal measurement, $I_c(\rho)$ is simply Bob's *accessible* information I_{acc} [10] about the uniform ensemble of states $\{|k\rangle, U_1|k\rangle\}_{k=0, \dots, d-1}$.

In general, the accessible information I_{acc} about an ensemble of states $\mathcal{E} = \{p_i \geq 0, \eta_i\}$ is the maximum mutual information between i and the outcome of a measurement. $I_{\text{acc}}(\mathcal{E})$ can be maximized by a POVM with rank 1 elements only [10]. Let $M = \{\alpha_j |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|\}_j$ stand for a POVM with rank 1 elements where each $|\phi_j\rangle$ is normalized and $\alpha_j > 0$. Then $I_{\text{acc}}(\mathcal{E})$ can be expressed as

$$I_{\text{acc}}(\mathcal{E}) = \max_M \left[- \sum_i p_i \log p_i + \sum_i \sum_j p_i \alpha_j \langle \phi_j | \eta_i | \phi_j \rangle \log \frac{p_i \langle \phi_j | \eta_i | \phi_j \rangle}{\langle \phi_j | \mu | \phi_j \rangle} \right], \quad (6)$$

where $\mu = \sum_i p_i \eta_i$.

We now apply Eq. (6) to the present problem. Our ensemble is $\{\frac{1}{2d}, U_t|k\rangle\}_{k,t}$ with $i = k, t$, $p_{k,t} = \frac{1}{2d}$, $\mu = \frac{I}{d}$, and $\langle \phi_j | \mu | \phi_j \rangle = \frac{1}{d}$. Putting all these in Eq. (6),

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(\rho) &= \max_M \left[\log 2d + \sum_{jkt} \frac{\alpha_j}{2d} |\langle \phi_j | U_t | k \rangle|^2 \log \frac{|\langle \phi_j | U_t | k \rangle|^2}{2} \right] \\ &= \max_M \left[\log d + \sum_j \frac{\alpha_j}{d} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{kt} |\langle \phi_j | U_t | k \rangle|^2 \log |\langle \phi_j | U_t | k \rangle|^2 \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\sum_j \alpha_j = d$ and $\forall_{jt} \sum_k |\langle \phi_j | U_t | k \rangle|^2 = 1$ to obtain the last line. Since $\sum_j \frac{\alpha_j}{d} = 1$, the second term is a convex combination, and can be upper bounded by maximization over just one term:

$$I_c(\rho) \leq \log d + \max_{|\phi\rangle} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kt} |\langle \phi | U_t | k \rangle|^2 \log |\langle \phi | U_t | k \rangle|^2. \quad (7)$$

Note that $-\sum_{kt} |\langle \phi | U_t | k \rangle|^2 \log |\langle \phi | U_t | k \rangle|^2$ is the sum of the entropies of measuring $|\phi\rangle$ in the computational basis and the conjugate basis. Reference [17] proves that such a sum of entropies is at least $\log d$. Lower bounds of these type are called entropic uncertainty inequalities, which

quantify how much a vector $|\phi\rangle$ cannot be simultaneously aligned with states from two conjugated bases. It follows that $I_c(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log d$. Equality can in fact be attained when Bob measures in the computational basis, so that $I_c(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \log d$ and $I_c^{(1)}(\rho) - I_c(\rho) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \log d$.

We remark that incremental proportionality remains violated for multiple copies of ρ . Wootters proved that [18] the accessible information from m independent draws of an ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ of separable states is additive, $I_{acc}(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes m}) = mI_{acc}(\mathcal{E})$. It follows $I_c(\rho^{\otimes m}) = mI_c(\rho)$ in our example.

One would expect a stronger locking effect when the message (a key) is longer than one bit. There are two figures of merit: First, the ‘‘amplification’’ of correlation, $r_1 = I_c(\rho')/I_c(\rho)$, should be large. Second, the amount of unlocked information, compared to the key size, $r_2 = (I_c(\rho') - I_c(\rho))/l$, should be large. Ideally, we want both r_1 and r_2 to be arbitrarily large. We have investigated (see the Appendix for details) this possibility by generalizing our 2-bases example to $L > 2$ conjugate (or mutually unbiased) bases. The key size is then $l = \log L$. We have found rigorous results for the two extreme cases, namely the previous example with $L = 2$ in which $(r_1, r_2) \approx (2, \log d)$ and the case of $L = d+1$ bases in which $(r_1, r_2) \approx (2 \log d, 2)$. We believe some intermediate values of L will make both r_1, r_2 large. For example, any $\log L = o(\log d)$ will guarantee that r_1 is large. But an analytic proof that r_2 is also large has proved to be difficult, and numerical studies are inconclusive (see Appendix).

An even stronger kind of locking would be what we call *complete* locking, in which $I_c(\rho)$ would decrease rapidly with the key size l , yet the key can retrieve a finite fraction of the data. For example,

$$I_c(\rho) \propto 2^{-\alpha l} \quad \text{and} \quad I_c(\rho') - l \approx \delta \log d. \quad (8)$$

where ρ is supported on two d -dimensional systems, $\delta > 0$ is independent of d, l , and $\alpha > 0$. Note that r_1, r_2 are automatically large for large d in complete locking. We find that for large d complete locking cannot occur with $\alpha \geq 1$ or for very short keys $l = o(\log \log d)$. This follows from the following Theorem:

Theorem 1 If ρ' is obtained from ρ with l bits of 1-way classical communication, $I_c(\rho) \geq 2^{-l}(I_c(\rho') - l)$. It follows $I_c^{(l)}(\rho) - I_c(\rho) \leq l + (2^l - 1)I_c(\rho)$.

The intuition behind the proof is that Bob can just guess the classical key. If he guesses correctly (with probability $\frac{1}{2^l}$), he gains $I_c(\rho')$ bits of information, so that the average information gain is at least $\frac{1}{2^l} I_c(\rho')$.

Proof. Let ρ' results from sending an l -bit message (or key) from Alice to Bob. Let the random variable $\tilde{Z}$ describe the key, and the random variable X be the outcome of Alice’s POVM measurement that optimizes $I_c(\rho')$. We can always include $\tilde{Z}$ as part of X . Bob applies one of 2^l possible measurements based on a random variable Z ,

yielding the outcome Y . To achieve $I_c(\rho')$, Bob takes $Z = \tilde{Z}$, and each of his measurements is optimal for each value of $\tilde{Z}$. Therefore [19]:

$$I_c(\rho') = I(X:Y\tilde{Z}|Z = \tilde{Z}) = I(X:Y\tilde{Z}|Z = \tilde{Z}). \quad (9)$$

Applying the chain rule [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} I(X:Y\tilde{Z}|Z = \tilde{Z}) &= I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}, Z = \tilde{Z}) + I(X:\tilde{Z}|Z = \tilde{Z}) \\ &\leq I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}, Z = \tilde{Z}) + l \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where we have used $I(X:\tilde{Z}|Z = \tilde{Z}) \leq l$ because l is the size of the key $\tilde{Z}$.

Working from the other end, consider the following not necessarily optimal measurement on ρ : Alice’s measurement is same as before, but $\tilde{Z}$ is not sent to Bob. Instead, Bob draws Z at random. The resulting mutual information provides a lower bound on $I_c(\rho)$, $I_c(\rho) \geq I(X:YZ)$. By the chain rule, we can write $I(X:YZ) = I(X:Y|Z) + I(X:Z) = I(X:Y|Z)$. Because Z is independent of X we have

$$I_c(\rho) \geq I(X:Y|Z). \quad (11)$$

Because $\tilde{Z}$ is part of X , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} I(X:Y|Z) &= I(X\tilde{Z}:Y|Z) \\ &= I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}Z) + I(\tilde{Z}:Y|Z) \geq I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}Z), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

again using the chain rule and $I(\tilde{Z}:Y|Z) \geq 0$.

Now, comparing (10) and (12),

$$I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}, Z = \tilde{Z}) = \sum_{z_0} \Pr(\tilde{Z} = z_0) I(X:Y|\tilde{Z} = z_0, Z = z_0), \quad (13)$$

$$I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}Z) = \sum_{z_0, z_1} \frac{\Pr(\tilde{Z} = z_0) I(X:Y|\tilde{Z} = z_0, Z = z_1)}{2^l}. \quad (14)$$

The sum (14) is the same sum as (13) but with some extra terms and a factor of $1/2^l$, so

$$I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}Z) \geq \frac{1}{2^l} I(X:Y|\tilde{Z}, Z = \tilde{Z}), \quad (15)$$

and putting together (15) and (9,10,11) proves the first statement. The second statement is true because there is only one round of communication; monotonicity then implies the optimal $\Lambda^{(l)}$ in (3) consists of just the communication. $\square$

We can bound the violation of incremental proportionality in yet another way. Total proportionality for I_c (when $I_c(\rho) = 0$, transmitting l qubits can increase I_c by at most l bits) can be restated as ‘‘ $I_c(\rho) = 0$ ’’ implies no incremental proportionality violation. We may thus expect a small violation of incremental proportionality when $I_c(\rho)$ is small. We are able to prove the following:

Theorem 2 Let ρ be a bipartite state on $C^d \otimes C^d$ and

ρ' be obtained from ρ by l qubits of two-way communication. If $I_c(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{6 \ln 2} \frac{1}{(d+1)^2}$,

$$I_c(\rho') - I_c(\rho) \leq 2l - (2d)^2 \sqrt{(2 \ln 2) I_c(\rho)} \log \sqrt{(2 \ln 2) I_c(\rho)}.$$

The proof of theorem 2 relies essentially on the following lemma (see the Appendix for a proof) which says that when $I_c(\rho)$ is small, ρ must be close to an uncorrelated state (in trace distance).

Lemma 1 If ρ is a bipartite state on $C^d \otimes C^d$, then

$$\text{Tr}|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B| \leq (2d)^2 \sqrt{2 \ln 2 I_c(\rho)}, \quad (16)$$

where $\rho_{A/B} = \text{Tr}_{B/A} \rho$.

The theorem can be proved by first relating I_c to I_q which obeys incremental proportionality (with an extra factor of 2). Then Lemma 1 and the continuity of I_q implies $I_q(\rho)$ is close to $I_q(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B)$, giving the desired bound (see the Appendix for details).

The weakness of Lemma 1 and thus that of Theorem 2 stems from the factor d^2 in Lemma 1. This factor comes from an analysis that uses measurements in all mutually unbiased bases to distinguish $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ from ρ , and the analysis is probably not optimal. Note that the dependence on the dimension d in the bound in Theorem 2 makes it impossible to completely rule out complete locking.

Our locking scheme is closely related to quantum key distribution (QKD), in particular BB84 [14], in which Alice holds a basis bit (computational or Hadamard) for each of Bob's qubits. Transmitting the locked state limits the classical correlation between Alice and any potential eavesdropper (Eve) and forbids her from tampering without disturbance. Announcing the basis bits at a later stage enables Alice and Bob to unlock the correlation. Furthermore, incomplete unlocked correlation (as indicated by the test bits) reveals Eve's tampering. However, in BB84, one bit is sent for every bit to be unlocked, and there is no extreme unlocking behavior as shown by our examples.

Further research into the phenomenon of locking will be worthwhile. For instance, we have seen differences in the locking effect by quantum and classical keys. Another important factor affecting the strength of locking is the number of rounds of communication allowed. In fact, a striking difference between one-way and two-way communications can be seen if one generalize the state in Eq. (5) so each of Alice and Bob has a one-bit key register, and the rotation U_t , now performed on both Bob's and Alice's state, is determined by the *parity* of the two key bits. Full unlocking is possible with two-way communication, but not with one-way communication. Finally, the possibility of complete locking, or the impossibility (by improving Lemma 1 and Theorem 2) are important

open questions; it may be interesting to see how complete locking relates to known restrictions on partial bit commitments [15].

Acknowledgments: We thank I. Devetak and C. Bennett for extremely helpful discussions, W. Wootters for enlightening discussion on mutually unbiased bases, and D. Gottesman for a discussion on complete locking. Part of this work was completed while MH was visiting at the MSRI program on Quantum Computation. MH is supported by EC, contract No. IST-2001-37559 (RESQ) and grant QUPRODIS, and also by IST-1999-11053 (EQUIP). DPDV, JAS and BMT are supported in part by the NSA and the ARDA through ARO contract No. DAAD19-01-C-0056. DWL acknowledges support by a Tolman fellowship and support from the NSF under Grant No. EIA-0086038.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
 - [2] E. Schrödinger, Naturwissenschaften **23**, 807 (1935).
 - [3] Special issue of Q. Info. Comp., vol. 1, 2001.
 - [4] W. Zurek, Ann. Phys. **9**, 5 (2000).
 - [5] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, quant-ph/0105028.
 - [6] H. Ollivier and W. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 17901 (2002), quant-ph/0105072.
 - [7] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002), quant-ph/0112074.
 - [8] B. Terhal, M. Horodecki, D. Leung, and D. DiVincenzo, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4286 (2002), quant-ph/0202044.
 - [9] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1991).
 - [10] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1993).
 - [11] When ρ is classical (pure), the measurement along the local product basis (Schmidt basis) is optimal by the data processing inequality [9] and the fact other measurement outcomes are obtainable by local processing of the optimal one.
 - [12] Obviously, $I_c(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) = 0$. The converse follows from Eq. (16) in Lemma 1.
 - [13] For example, (total and) incremental proportionality of $I(A : B)$ for the classical case follows from the fact [9] that $\max(H(p_A), H(p_B)) \leq H(p_{AB}) \leq H(p_A) + H(p_B)$, so that when Alice sends a classical system A' to Bob, $I_c(\rho') = I(A; BA') \leq I(AA'; B) + H(p_{A'})$.
 - [14] C. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proc. of IEEE Int. Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India (IEEE, New York) p. 175 (1984).
 - [15] R. Spekkens and T. Rudolph (2001), quant-ph/0106019.
 - [16] R. Spekkens and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 227901 (2002).
 - [17] H. Maassen and J. Uffink, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1103 (1988).
 - [18] D. DiVincenzo, D. Leung, and B. Terhal, IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **48**, 580 (2001), quant-ph/0103098.
 - [19] Quantities like $I(X; Y \tilde{Z} Z | Z = \tilde{Z})$ that appear in Eq. (9) and the following can be thought of as a shorthand for

$I(X; Y\tilde{Z}Z|w=1)$, where W is a random variable whose value is 1 if $Z = \tilde{Z}$ and is 0 otherwise.

- [20] W. Wootters and B. Fields, Ann. Phys. **191**, 368 (1989).
- [21] S. Bandyopadhyay, P. Boykin, V. Roychowdhury, and F. Vatan (2001), quant-ph/0103162.
- [22] J. Sanchez, Phys. Lett. A **173**, 233 (1993).
- [23] M. Fannes, Commun. Math. Phys. **31**, 291 (1973).
- [24] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum Entropy and Its Use* (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1993).
- [25] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland (2001), quant-ph/0112106.

APPENDIX

Locking with more bases

Intuitively, we expect a larger key to exert a stronger locking effect (i.e., give a larger value of $I_c^{(l)}(\rho) - I_c(\rho)$). For instance, we have seen how classical mutual information can be locked by encoding in one of two bases. A natural question is, can we lock more information by encoding in $L > 2$ bases? A convenient choice of such bases are the mutually conjugate or *mutually unbiased* bases, with the defining property that the inner product between any two states from two different bases has magnitude $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ in a d -dimensional system. It is known that one can have at most $d + 1$ mutually conjugate bases in d dimensions, and this maximum number of bases exists and can be constructed when d is a prime power [20, 21]. Let $U_1, \dots, U_d$ take the computation basis to each of these conjugate basis and $U_0 = I$. In a scheme using L bases (with key size $l = \log L$),

$$\rho = \frac{1}{Ld} \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} (|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|)_A \otimes (U_t|k\rangle\langle k|U_t^\dagger)_B. \quad (17)$$

When Alice tells Bob which basis t , the resulting state ρ' again has $I_c(\rho') = \log L + \log d = l + \log d$. Applying the same analysis as before,

$$I_c(\rho) \leq \log d + \max_{|\phi\rangle} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{kt} |\langle \phi | U_t | k \rangle|^2 \log |\langle \phi | U_t | k \rangle|^2. \quad (18)$$

When $L = 2$, $I_c(\rho) = \frac{1}{L} \log d$. Thus one would hope $I_c(\rho) = \frac{1}{L} \log d$ in general. Unfortunately, the crucial entropic inequality in Ref. [17] does not provide the desired bound. Extensive numerical work on primes $3 \leq d \leq 29$ and $2 \leq L \leq d + 1$ shows that $I_c(\rho) \approx (\frac{1}{L} + c) \log d$ where c is roughly 0.1 – 0.15 for the values of d investigated.

In the extreme case of $L = d + 1$, we can apply another entropic inequality [22] namely that the sum of the entropies is at least $(d + 1) \log(\frac{d+1}{2})$, so that

$$I_c(\rho) \leq \log d - \log(d + 1) + 1 = 1 - \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{d}\right) \quad \text{and} \\ I_c(\rho') - I_c(\rho) \geq 2 \log(d + 1) - 1$$

This still unlocks $\approx \log d$ bits, though the amount is comparable to the $\log(d + 1)$ bits communicated and thus we have no (strong) violation of incremental proportionality in this regime.

Small initial correlation

In Theorem 1, the difference between $I_c(\rho)$ and $I_c(\rho')$ is bounded by the product of the initial correlation and the number of different messages that can be sent. Here,

we bound the violation by a function of the initial correlation only, allowing an arbitrary number of qubits communicated interactively. More formally,

Theorem 2 Let ρ be a bipartite state on $C^d \otimes C^d$ and ρ' be obtained from ρ by l qubits of two-way communication. Let $d' < 2d$ be the least prime power no less than d , and $\eta(x) = -x \log x$. If $I_c(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{6 \ln 2} \frac{1}{(d'+1)^2}$,

$$I_c(\rho') - I_c(\rho) \leq 2l + 2(d'+1)^2 \sqrt{2I_c(\rho) \ln 2} \log d + \eta((d'+1)^2 \sqrt{2I_c(\rho) \ln 2}).$$

A simpler, but less tight expression can be obtained from the above by expanding the log function in η :

$$I_c(\rho') - I_c(\rho) \leq 2l - (d'+1)^2 \sqrt{(2 \ln 2) I_c(\rho)} \log \sqrt{(2 \ln 2) I_c(\rho)}.$$

Thus even for the most general communication model, incremental proportionality violation is continuous in the initial correlations, with incremental proportionality holding when the initial state is uncorrelated (a special case of pure initial states). However the present bound is not uniform with respect to the size of the support of ρ : To get $I_c(\rho') \leq 2l + \delta$, we need approximately $I_c(\rho) \leq \delta^2 (2d)^{-4}$.

Proof: The theorem can be proved by putting together various properties of $I_c(\rho)$ and $I_q(\rho)$, and the main steps of the proof can be summarized as:

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(\rho') - I_c(\rho) &\leq I_c(\rho') \stackrel{1}{\leq} I_q(\rho') \stackrel{2}{\leq} 2l + I_q(\rho) \\ &\stackrel{3}{\leq} 2l + \log d^2 \text{Tr}|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B - \rho_{AB}| + \eta(\text{Tr}|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B - \rho_{AB}|) \\ &\stackrel{4}{\leq} 2l + 2(\log d)(d'+1)^2 \sqrt{2I_c(\rho) \ln 2} + \eta((d'+1)^2 \sqrt{2I_c(\rho) \ln 2}) \end{aligned}$$

First, we explain the intuition behind the properties that make each step valid, then, we complete the proof by proving each of the steps. The idea is to upper bound I_c by I_q and use incremental proportionality of I_q [8] in steps 1 and 2. Then it remains to show that I_q is small if I_c is small, and this is done in steps 3 and 4. Step 3 expresses I_q as a difference of the entropies $S(\rho)$ and $S(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B)$, which is subsequently bounded by Fannes' inequality [23]. Step 4 is to prove and apply the following lemma:

Lemma 1 If ρ is a bipartite state on $C^d \otimes C^d$, then

$$\text{Tr}|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B| \leq (d' + 1)^2 \sqrt{2 \ln 2 I_c(\rho)}, \quad (19)$$

where $d' < 2d$ is a prime power no less than d .

This lemma says that a state with small classical mutually information is close to being a product state, and a simple consequence is that $I_c(\rho) = 0$ iff ρ is a product state. Steps 3 and 4 give the desired bound of I_q in terms of I_c : If $I_c \leq \frac{1}{6 \ln 2} \frac{1}{(d'+1)^2}$ then

$$I_q \leq 2(d'+1)^2 \sqrt{2I_c(\rho) \ln 2} \log d + \eta((d'+1)^2 \sqrt{2I_c(\rho) \ln 2}).$$

We proceed to prove steps 1, 3, and 4. First, I_c and I_q can be rewritten as [24]:

$$I_q(\rho) = S(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_A \otimes \rho_B), \quad (20)$$

$$I_c(\rho) = \max_{M_A \otimes M_B} S(p_{AB} \| p_A \otimes p_B), \quad (21)$$

where p_{AB}, p_A, p_B are the probability distributions of the joint and individual outcomes of applying a local measurement $M_A \otimes M_B$ to ρ , and the quantum relative entropy is defined as

$$S(\nu \| \mu) := \text{Tr}(\nu \log \nu) - \text{Tr}(\nu \log \mu). \quad (22)$$

To prove step 1, let M_A and M_B be the optimal measurements for $I_c(\rho)$. Let Λ be the local quantum operation of applying $M_A \otimes M_B$ followed by storing the classical outcomes in ancillas A' and B' and discarding of the original systems A and B . The final state $\tilde{\rho}_{A'B'} = \Lambda(\rho)$ is a classical state corresponding to p_{AB} so that

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(\rho) &= S(p_{AB} \| p_A \otimes p_B) \\ &= S(\tilde{\rho}_{A'B'} \| \tilde{\rho}_{A'} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{B'}) \\ &\leq S(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_A \otimes \rho_B) = I_q(\rho), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the inequality in Eq. (23) is due to monotonicity of $I_q(\rho)$ under the local operation Λ .

To prove step 3, recall Fannes' inequality [23] for d_0 -dimensional states ν, μ with $\text{Tr}|\nu - \mu| \leq 1/e$,

$$|S(\nu) - S(\mu)| \leq \log d_0 \text{Tr}|\nu - \mu| + \eta(\text{Tr}|\nu - \mu|)$$

Hence, if $\text{Tr}|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B - \rho_{AB}| \leq 1/e$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_q(\rho) &= S(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) \\ &\leq 2 \log d \text{Tr}|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B - \rho_{AB}| + \eta(\text{Tr}|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B - \rho_{AB}|). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Once Lemma 1 is proved, step 4 can be obtained by substituting Eq. (19) into Eq. (24). We prove Lemma 1 for ρ on $C^d \otimes C^d$ where $d = p^n$ is a prime power. The general case follows, because when d is not a prime power, ρ can still be taken as a state on $C^{d'} \otimes C^{d'}$ where $d' < 2d$ is the least prime power no less than d . The main idea in the proof is to rewrite $\text{Tr}|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B|$ as a sum, each term of which is bounded by the initial classical mutual information of ρ . This relies on the following result proved for $d = p^n$ [20, 21]. There exists a basis $\{M_k^i\}_{k=1, \dots, d+1, i=1, \dots, d-1}$ for traceless $d \times d$ matrices, such that $\text{Tr} M_k^{i\dagger} M_l^j = d \delta_{kl} \delta_{ij}$, i.e. orthonormal under the trace norm up to a scaling factor. Furthermore, for each k , $\{M_k^i\}_{i=1, \dots, d-1}$ is a commuting set, and can be simultaneously diagonalized by conjugation by some $U_k^\dagger$.

Using $\{M_k^i\}_{i,k} \cup \{I\}$ as a basis for $d \times d$ matrices, we can express ρ_{AB} as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} &= \frac{1}{d^2} \left[I \otimes I + \sum_{ki} \alpha_{ki00} M_k^i \otimes I + \sum_{lj} \alpha_{00lj} I \otimes M_j^l \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{kilj} \alpha_{kilj} M_k^i \otimes M_j^l \right] \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with generally complex coefficients α_{kilj} . Using the commutativity of each $\{M_i^k\}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{d^2} & \left[I \otimes I + \sum_k (U_k E_k U_k^\dagger) \otimes I + \sum_l I \otimes (U_l F_l U_l^\dagger) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{kl} (U_k \otimes U_l) D_{kl} (U_k \otimes U_l)^\dagger \right] \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

for some diagonal matrices E_k , F_k , and D_{kl} where each E_k , F_k is $d \times d$, and each D_{kl} is $d^2 \times d^2$. Then,

$$\rho_A = \frac{1}{d} \left[I + \sum_k U_k E_k U_k^\dagger \right], \quad \rho_B = \frac{1}{d} \left[I + \sum_k U_k F_k U_k^\dagger \right],$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B &= \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{kl} (U_k \otimes U_l) (D_{kl} - E_k \otimes F_k) (U_k \otimes U_l)^\dagger \\ \text{Tr} |\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B| &\leq \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{kl} \text{Tr} |D_{kl} - E_k \otimes F_k| \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{kl} \text{Tr} |p_{kl} - q_{kl}| \leq (d+1)^2 \sqrt{2 \ln 2 S(p_{kl} || q_{kl})},$$

where the last inequality follows from $S(\nu || \mu) \geq \frac{1}{2 \ln 2} (\text{Tr} |\nu - \mu|)^2$ [24, 25]. In the above, p_{kl} and q_{kl} are probability distributions of the outcomes when locally measuring ρ and $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ along the simultaneously tensor product eigenbasis of $\{M_i^k\}_i$ and $\{M_i^l\}_i$. In each of these measurements, only the kl terms contribute due to the orthonormality of the basis chosen. According to Eq. (21), the relative entropy between p_{kl} and q_{kl} is a lower bound for I_c . Thus,

$$\text{Tr} |\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B| \leq (d+1)^2 \sqrt{2 \ln 2 I_c(\rho)} \quad (27)$$

This completes the proofs for all the steps and thus our theorem.